



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/812,856	03/30/2004	Yuichiro Nishina	291597-00001	3455

3705 7590 03/03/2006

ECKERT SEAMANS CHERIN & MELLOTT
600 GRANT STREET
44TH FLOOR
PITTSBURGH, PA 15219

EXAMINER

MILLER, DANIEL H

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

1775

DATE MAILED: 03/03/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/812,856	NISHINA, YUICHIRO	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Daniel Miller	1775	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 2-4 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____. |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____. | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____. |

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
 - I. Claim 1, drawn to a method of growing carbon nanotubes, classified in class 423, subclass 445R.
 - II. Claims 2-4, drawn to carbon nanotubes in a quartz tube, classified in class 428, subclass 408.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

2. Inventions of Group I and Group II are related as process of making and product made. The inventions are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the process as claimed can be used to make another and materially different product or (2) that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process (MPEP § 806.05(f)). In the instant case product can be made using a materially different method. For instance, the carbon nanotubes could be grown separately then deposited in a quartz tube.

3. Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art in view of their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

4. During a telephone conversation with Arnold Silverman on 1/15/06 a provisional election was made without traverse to prosecute the invention of Group II, claims 2-4.

Affirmation of this election must be made by applicant in replying to this Office action.

Art Unit: 1775

Claim 1 is withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner, 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a non-elected invention.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

5. Claims 2-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.
6. Claim 2 recites the limitation "resultant" in preamble. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.
7. Claim 4 recites the limitation "The carbon nanotubes" in first line. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.
8. The claims are generally narrative and indefinite, failing to conform to current U.S. practice. They appear to be a literal translation into English from a foreign document and are replete with grammatical and idiomatic errors.
9. Please note that claim 1, from which it is the examiners interpretation claims 2-4 were meant to depend, contains three sentences. Correction required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

10. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

Art Unit: 1775

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

11. Claims 2-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Smalley (U.S. 6,183,714B1).

12. Regarding claims 2-4, Smalley teaches a carbon nanotube in a quartz tube that encompasses the nanotubes (column 7 line 53-68). The carbon nanotubes form ropes (column 1 line 30-40) and which are formed from bundles of nanotubes (column 12 line 55-60). Regarding claim 3, the bundles comprise 10 to 1000 nanotubes (column 14 line 7-14). Regarding claim 4, the bundles can each have a diameter of 0.5 inches (column 11 line 40-43) with 7 bundles (column 12 line 36-39). The claim is being interpreted to be referring to the cross section of multiple bundles. However, the reference is silent as to the O.D. of the quartz tube and the specific cross section of one or all of the nanotube ropes.

13. Applicant is reminded that it is the product itself, which must be new and unobvious, see *In re Pinkington* 162 USPQ 145, 147 (C.C.P.A. 1969). Product by process claimed are not patentably distinct over product claims unless it can be shown that the product produced by the process is in some manner measurably distinct from the product produced by another process, therefore there will be no weight given to the product by process verses product claims.

14. Smalley teaches the nanotubes are useful in any application where an electrical conductor is needed (column 4 line 10-15). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Smalley to conform to the specifications of a particular electrical application.


Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Daniel Miller whose telephone number is (571) 272-1534. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Deborah Jones can be reached on (571) 272-1535. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


Daniel Miller


JENNIFER MCNEIL
PRIMARY EXAMINER
2/26/06